OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Oil and Gas

In the Matter of:

MEETING OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

Copy to Mr. Vincent M. Drown Secretary - Treasurer National Peterleum Course

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL, INC.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS 917 G STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON 1, D. C.

628-4266

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

in the matter of: MEETING OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

PLACE - Washington, D. C.

DATE - Thursday, March 19, 1964

were held as herein appears, and that this is a copy of the transcript thereof for the files of the Department.

WARD & PAUL, Inc. Official Reporter

Wayne Birdsell, Secretary

St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

25

E.	L.	STE	INI	GER,	Pres	ident
Si	acla	ir	011	Corp	orat	ion

R. E. NELSON, Alternate for John E. Swearingen, Standard Oil Company (Indiana)

H. A. TRUE, JR., President, Independent Peroleum Association of America

R. L. VOCKEL, Vice President The Waverly Oil Works Company

H. F. WAGNER, Director, Petroleum Division, Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc.

J. ED WARREN, President, Cities Service Company

EVERETT F. WELLS, President, Ashland Oil and Refining Company

E. V. POTTER, Alternate for W. C. Whaley, Sunray DX Oil Company

S. D. WHITEMAN, Chairman of the Board, Kansas-Nebraska Natural Gas Company, Inc.

J. GEER WILCOX, President, American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors

4

8

ר ר

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

to order. As is our custom, we will start by calling the roll. We have a number of new members and when we come to the new members, Mr. Brown will pause and I would like to ask them to stand and let me introduce them to the Council. Mr. Brown, will you please call the roll?

SECRETARY BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Abernathy.

Mr. Anderson, Mr. Robert Anderson.

Mr. Baldridge,

Mr. Perry Bass.

Mr. Henry Beeson.

MR. BEESON: Here.

CMAIRMAN FOLLIS: Mr. Beeson is president of the Matural Gas Processors Association. Welcome to our Council meeting, Mr. Beeson.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Benedum.

Mr. Bergfors.

Mr. Blaustein.

MR. BLAUSTEIN: Here.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Boyd.

Mr. Brazell.

MR. BRAZELL: Present.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Midwell.

WARD & PAI

 \mathcal{C}

17 G Si., N. W., Washington 1, D. C

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Here.

Secretary brown; Mr. Foree.

MR. FOREE: Here.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Mr. Foree,

Foree is of the Texas Indepe

CMAIRMAN FOLLIS: Mr. Force, welcome back to the Council. Mr. Force is of the Texas Independent Producers and Roy-alty Owners Association.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Fountain.

Mr. Fox.

Mr. Garver.

MR. GARVER: Here.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Would you stand, sir? Mr. Garver is president of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America. Welcome to the Council.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Getty.

Mr. Goggin.

Mr. Graham.

MR. GRAHAM: Here.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Graves.

MR. GRAVES: Here.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Green.

Mr. Hall.

M.r Mamon.

MR. HAMON: Here.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. Harper.

MR. HARPER: Here.

SECRETARY BROWN: Mr. McGee.

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

٦٦

12

13

74

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

utes	ο£	the	last	meeting	and	1£	there	are	no	add	litions	or	cor-
recti	Lons	I I	wou1d	apprecia	ite a	a Hiệ	otion	to a	ppro	ove	them.		

(Upon motion duly made and seconded the minutes of the last meeting were unanimously approved.)

Now, could we have the report, Mr. CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Brown, of the Secretary-Treasurer?

SECRETARY BROWN: Gentlemen, in my report this morning I would like to give you a brief summation of the Council's financial status.

At the beginning of the fiscal year 1964 we had a cash balance in the general operating account of \$20,213. During the 8-month period ending February 29, 1964, our receipts totaled \$118,000, \$114,000 of this coming from contributions by Council members, and the remaining \$4,000 being receips that came from interest on savings, sales of publications, and other sources.

In this mame 8-months period July 1 to February 29, a total of \$86,213 had been expended for our operations which in addition to the usual staff functions involved expenditures in connection with five committee assignments, so that the cash balance at the end of February stood at \$52,000.

The value of securities in our contingent reserve remains unchanged since my last report to you, \$50,000.

> That covers my report this morning, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

We have a resignation of one of the members of the

l

 γ

Appointments Committee, Mr. Decker, and I would like to propose -- I would like to ask a proposal of a nomination to fill that vacancy.

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Mr. Swearingen for that vacancy.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Is there a second?

FROM THE FLOOR: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Are there any other nominations? (No response.)

Now, gentlemen, you may have noticed that we have

CMAIRMAN FOLLIS: If not, the nominations are closed.

All those in favor please say aye; opposed? So ordered.

changed the order of our agenda a little bit, with the thought that it might be desirable to get our housekeeping and internal affairs out of the way so that our guests when they come will be able to see us address ourself to the business of our relationship and our function rather than in our internal affairs.

I do have one internal matter that I would like to discuss and that is the sequence of the term of office of the officers of the Council. We really have not faced up to this question, whether the Council officers should continue on rather long or indefinite terms or whether we should rotate these offices in the same way that most of the advisory committees and trade associations have found most desirable. I personally think that in an industry like ours where we have enormous div-

`.

ersification of organizations and very large and wide-spread geographical areas, it is important and desirable that the officers, particularly the chairman ship of the Council, retate so that various geographical and structural representations can show in the chairmanship of the Council.

So, I am proposing that I will not, you might say, stand for re-election next year and that you address yourself to selecting a new Chairman and other elective officers.

Now, in order to do that with the maximum thought it seemed to me that it would be desirable for me to appoint a mominating committee at this meeting rather than waiting until the day of the organization meeting as we have done in the past, and therefore I am going to propose a committee which I would like to ask be considering this matter with the thought that at the next meeting they will nominate a new slate of officers for the Council. The Committee that I would like to propose are the following:

Mr. Benedum, Mr. Blaustein, Mr. Bruce Brown, Mr. Donnell, Charles Jones, McCollum, Majuski, Milligan, Parten, Robineau, Windfohr, Steiniger, Vendeveer, Ed Warren and Pratt Rather. I would like to ask Mr. Millgan to serve as chairman of that committee.

I might make one further comment before I call on Z ? The Chairman of the Agency Committee to say that I recognize that we have exceeded the time that we contemplated in our re-

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

1.5

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vision of the by-laws recently as to the frequency of meetings. It was the contemplation that we should have three meetings a year.

At this particular time we had two very complex and very challenging assignments that would not have been ready, and A) it seemed pretty obvious to me that we should not call a meeting that did not have real substance to it because, living where I do I think I am probably as conscious as anyone of the distance and the time that it takes many of us to assemble for these meetings. So that resulted in a delay which was slightly compounded by the fact that our cochairman was called out of the country, which threby necessitated a further delay.

But I think today that you will agree that by waiting we have gotten ourselves in a position where we have something of substance to review and that the meeting will be meaningful and worthwhile to you."

The next item on the agenda is the report of the Agenda Committee. Mr. Jacobson at the last minute due to a change in scheduling that took place on this meeting was unable to come and I have asked Mr. Jake Hamon to act as chairman of the Agenda Committee for the purpose of this meeting. Mr. Hamon.

MR. HAMON: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Cochairman:

Before I make this report I must say that I want to convey to your members Mr. Jacobson's regrets at being unable to be hees. And if it is in order, Mr. Chairman, on account of

11.

his faithful service -- and this is probably the first Council meeting he has missed to my knowledge. I would like to move that we miss him and want to commend him for his past labors on this committee, if I can get a second.

VOICES: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Can we have a vote on that? I would like to be able to report that that was unanimously endorsed by the Council. Thank you. Unanimously endorsed.

MR. HAMON: Pursuant to the call of the meeting of the Agency Committee of the National Petroleum Council made by the Committee Chairman, Mr. Jacobson and wired to the members on March 4, and with the meeting and its agenda having the approval of the Honorable John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of the In terior, the Government Cochairman of the Committee, the Agenda Committee met on March 18, 1964 at 4 p.m. at the offices of the Council and again on March 19 at 9:00 a.m. in the offices of the committee cochairman.

Under date of March 16, 1964 the Henorable John M.

Kelly addressed a letter to Mr. R. G. Follis, Chairman of the National Petroleum Council, requesting the Council to explore approaches to the problem of emergency fuel convertability in the national economy excluding electric utility generating stations and advise as to the category of fuel consumers that may be advantageously studied with reference to the subject. As provided in the articles of the organization of the Council this

 η_{ij}

letter was considered at the above-mentioned meeting of the agenda committee, at which meeting it was unanimously agreed to recommend to the Council the appointment of a committee to make the study as requested by Secretary Kelly and report to the Council. The scope of this study will be confined to physical facilities without regard to economics or availability of alternate sources of fuel supplies.

In complying with Secretary Kelly's request for appropriate comments and recommendations the committee undertaking the study should not suggest plans or programs.

Under date of March 19, 1964 the Honerable John M.

Kelly addressed a letter to Mr. Follis, Chairman of the National Petroleum Council, requesting the Council to prepare a report which will up-date as of January 1, 1964 the information presented in the Council's 1961 report entitled, "Proved discoveries and productive capacity of cruid oil, natural gas and natural gas liquids in the United States." The report should be in a form similar to that of the earlier one except that projections of the productive capacity will not be required.

As provided in the articles of organization of the Council this letter was considered at the above-mentioned meeting of the agenda committee, at which committee meeting it was unanimously agreed to recommend to the council the appointment of a committee or committees to make the study as requested by Secretary Kelly and to report to the Council.

1.3

1.5

In complying with Secretary Kelly's request for appropriate comment and recommendations the committee or committees undertaking the study should not suggest plans or programs.

Mr. Chairman I move the adoption of the report.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Is there a second?

VOICES: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: All in favor of the motion say aye. (Unanimously carried.)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you, Mr. Hamon.

Now, next we will have as our honored speaker,

Senator Russell Long of Louisiana. I know that Senator Long
needs no introduction to the oil industry. We have all been
following his very important activities in relation to the tax
bill where he was the SEnate Floor leader that put the tax bill
through the Senate and which brought about the fact that today
it is law.

I think beyond that, though, for the 15 years that senator Long has been in the United States Senate, representing one of the great oil States of the Country, he has shown an interest and developed a knowledgeability in relation to oil matters that must call for our highest regard and highest confidence. I think we are constantly seeing occasions where Senator Long's sound judgment has guided our government in matters of oil that are very important not only for the country but to

917 G St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

ourselves.

Senator, I think I can make very little introduction of you to this group. You need no introduction. But I would like to say to you, since this is your first visit to our group, that we do welcome you most warnly. And I might my by way of introducing ourselves to you, that this Council is composed of some 95 representatives of the oil industry who have been appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to operate in an entirely voluntary basis. We are here to serve the government, and also to learn from representatives of the government, such as you, what policies would be those that would be most to the interest of the country as a whole. So, Senator Long, we look ferward to hearing your remarks.

SENATOR LONG: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Follis. It is a pleasure to be here with this group and as you have indicated, this is my first appearance before your group.

I address you with considerable trepidation because I don't know all the different discussions which you people have had already and perhaps what I have to say here may be a complete repetion of what has been said and discussed over and over by many of your members.

I am reminded somewhat of the situation that occurred to me one time when I was speaking to a flood control group in Louisiana. I was talking about this one project and everybody from the local governing officials to the State officials, the Army engineers, plus a lot of other folks, plus the Congressman.

6

11

10

12 13

14

1.5

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had of course discussed this project before they got around to me and there really wasn't anything left to say. And when I started to make my speech on the subject, some fellow got up in the back of the audience and said, "Why don't you just shut up? You haven t said anything new."

And after I had gone on for a while he got up again and he again said, "Now, why don't you just shut up and let us go home? It's getting late." He said, "You're not saying anything anyway."

And I tried to wind the speech up but it took a little while, I just couldn't find the right point, the right note to conclude on and before I got through the guy got up and said something like that again. So when I did wind up my speech the mayor of the city got hold of me and said, "Now, look, please don't feel hurt about that matter. That fellow don't mean a word of what he is saying. That is the town idot."

(Laughter)

SENATOR LONG: "He's just repeating what people aroun d him are maying."

(Laughter.)

Now, I'm about that same way in dis-SENATOR LONG: cussing some of your problems. But let me say that I am one of the members of the Congress that does not object at all to being described as an oil senator. I come from a State that produces more oil and gas than any State in the Union.

one time I was discussing the oil problem with President Kennedy and he made that point to me. He said, "I don't know why it is that people don't seem to get upset about some fellow who comes from a cotton state being regarded as a cotton SEnator or a fellow from a dairy state being regarded as a dairy senator or from a tobacco State being regarded as a tobacco Senator. But for some reason or another if you come from an oil State, to be regarded as an oil Senator has semething wrong about that."

about it. I am very proud of it. I feel somewhat like a friend of my mine who got one of his first good cases representing a man who wanted to drill an exploratory well, a shallow well, not too expensive, and he hoped that it would be a success, and he decided that he would gamble on staking his fee in a share in the well, that is the fee for doing the title work on this property. When the thing came in he was so happy about the whole matter he just charged right out into the middle of the pool, just took a bath in the oil, he was so happy about the matter. And I sort of feel that way representing a State like Louisiana.

We are just as proud as we can be that we do produce more oil than any State in this nation — compared to our size.

Now, please keep in mind — (laughter) — we're not as big as the State of Texas, and we don't have anything like the popula-

٦

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

tion of the State of Texas. But if you give us credit for our off-shore areas we potentially can produce more gas than the whole State of Texas. Now, I am not talking about the gas that politicians manufacture.

(Laughter)

SENATOR LONG: I am talking about the gas that you can burn at the burner point. And we have potentially more reserve than Texas, I believe, in that regard, if you give us credit for the off-shore areas.

I am somewhat at odds with these fellows that are always whipping the oil in dustry on the Senate Floor and elsewhere. I feel somewhat the way you must feel in a number of respects. I get these letters now and then from people who are on the same side I am on but just keep whipping me because thinds are not the way they like them to be -- or perhaps more so. know that there is much criticism heaped on your industry because of the oil depletion allowance, which is a matter that these other people don't understand.

And I know that sometimes you wish that someone would thank you for the good work that you are doing. Well, I am here to thank you for the good work that you are going. appreciate all that you are doing, because it is pretty essential for the economy of this country and very essential for the State I represent and for the people whom I represent, as well as also being very important to the nation.

I suppose some of you either directly or indirectly had something to do with the chartsthat I presented on the Senate Floor during the tax debate specifically when the depletion allowance was being discussed. Those charts demonstrated how much taxes the oil industry was actually paying. It showed not only what the federal taxes would be but what the State tax is and also how much excise taxes this industry is paying.

I believe it is fair to say that if you give this industry credit not just for the income tax at the federal level
but for all the State taxes they pay I believe you would find
that perhaps it is the biggest tax payer in the Stateswhere it
is a major producer. And you would also find that it pays
about the industry average as far as taxes are concerned, at
the income and the property tax level if you give it credit for
what it is paying to the State as well as what it is paying to
the Federal Government.

It is true that on the Federal income tax it might appear somewhat smallerbut if you give it credit for the disproportionately heavy share of taxes it pays for the support of the State governments, then that industry pays about the national average towards the support of government.

And that is not givingit credit for the excise tax.

Now, if you give this industry credit for the excise taxes it

pays I believe you would find that this industry is perhaps the

largest tax payer of any industry in America. Of course, that

is something that people don't want to give you credit for.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is always someone that wants to whip this industry for some reason. I have always wondered why that could be or should be. I just saw the other day where a publication of the Treasury came out -- and I thought I was a friendly with those people. In fact some people had the impression that that tax bill wouldn't have passed if the Senator from Louisiana hadn't managed that bill for them.

The Chairman wasn't for it. If I hadn't been for it they would have had to have gone down the Committee one more seat to find somebody for it and there were enough of those who were for some of the amendments that would have gutted that bill and made it so irresponsible that the President couldn't sign it -- and we might not have had a tax cut bill.

And after helping these people down at Treasury with that, then we go and pick up a publication that discusses various things in the tax laws and it has a little diagram -- it has diagrams to illustrate the problems in it.

Here is an old man receiving his Social Security check, or something of that sort. Now, that always brings a warm feeling to my heart, somebody getting his welfare check, or something of that sort.

But then here comes a picture with a heading of Depletion Allowances. Well, it has a picture of an oil well and here it shows people lounging around that swimming pool and a waiter carrying them some alcoholic beverages, and all

6

9

10

8

11

12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 these people are shown living the life of Riley just because of the depletion allowance.

Well, I addressed myself to the Secretary about that. Somebody called it to my attention and I addressed myself to the Secretary because it showed a bias and a prejudice and an indication of the general thinking in that area.

And I sort of wonder why the oil industry has been made a whipping boy by some of these n ewspapers and some of these liberal columnists. And about the only explanation that I could come up with would have nothing to do with your activities or your conduct. It seems to me it is mainly because the people in the Eastern area where most of the money is -- I regret to say -- and where most of the center of the news distribution seems to be, don't produce much oil. And I guess they are kind of like everybody else in business -- anything they buy they want to buy real cheap and anything they sell they want to sell high. And so I suppose they would like to export money to us at high interest rates on the money market and export everything else they produce at the highest rate they can get for it; but anything we can sell, if we make any profit from it at all, they would make it seems make it appear as something that was extremely unfair.

As I said, I demonstrated the charts that your people helped to prepare in the course of the debate, and it showed that the profit for industry in manufacturing generally is higher

than the profit in the gas and oil industry.

The profit for industry and manufacturing generally is higher, I repeat, than the profit for the domestic oil and gas industry, which I believe tends to demonstrate there is no justification for raising taxes on the oil industry and there is no justification to cutting your depletion allowance. That didn't keep some people from voting for it.

I am happy to say this, however, that in the United States Senate this year when we passed the tax bill which I was managing on the Floor of the Senate, those who tried to heap additional taxes on you and those who tried to cut your depletion allowances got less votes this year than they got in any previous year. This is the first year that they fell off in the vote they had available to them and I think that's a good sign. I don't anybody should get over-confident in that matter, but it is a good sign because every year prior to that since I have been here the people who wanted to heap additional taxes on this industry were more successful than this time.

I as representing a producing State believe I speak for those who represent all oil States in this regard, and that is that those of us in the Congress particularly interested in your industry are especially in terested in the domestic phases of the industry, because that is the part that gives employment to our people and means revenue to our State governments, and it is essential to our economy.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

Q

`ገገ

12 13

1.4 15

1.6

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Now, we recognize the need of oil importations, and we know that if we don't go overseas to produce that oil, someone else is going to do it. It is essential to the economy of the country and we are well aware of the fact that there is a tremendous net income from overseas operations that come in from oil. But we would like you fellows that produce oil overseas to realize this, that when problems come up with regard to your tax credit overseas or even your depletion allowance overseas, or the special tax treatment to your employees that you have overseas, the fellows you are going to rely upon to protect your activities in that respect are the same people who are interested in the domestic production of oil here.

And the people who go in -- for example, Senator Gore put an amendment on the tex bill that would greatly impede your operations overseasby increasing taxes on anybody that you send over there. And that amendment received support by a lot of persons that didn't really understand the situation, didn't understand what the problem was, but these would have created all sorts of problems for you to try to find someone who doesn't want to go and coax the man to go over there and manage your business in foreign countries.

Senator Williams was successful in getting an amendment put on the bill that would have increased taxes by about \$40 million on oeverseas operations by denying oil companies the full use of their tax credit. Now, let me say that that amend-

ment went on the bill at a time when the Senator from Louisiana was not in the committee room. I received a letter from some fellow a while back who wasn't pleased with my activities and was accusing me of being an ineffectual Senator. What he was mad about was something I succeeded in doing, in fact I suspect at this point he would think I was altogether too effective.

But this is one of those situations, I would like you to know, where I had to go down to the White House for a ceremony that had been arranged a month in advance affecting my State — and this shows one of the ways that the Senator from Louisiana is looking after you folks — and during the half hour that I was out of that committee room is when they put that \$40 million on it. And when I got back in the room, I managed to water that amendment back down by about \$30 million and inconference we dropped it altogether.

But on that amendment and on the Gore amendment we were successful in completely eliminating one of them in conference and paring the other one down to where it did you no serious injury, and in both instances the strong man on the jury on both sides of that committee table representing the United States Senate and representing the House of Representatives in the conference between those two Houses on the tax bill, the strong man on the jury in both sides as far as you are concerned was someone that comes from a State that produces a lot of domestic oil. And I believe your industry would make a great mis-

G St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

917 G St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

not to realize that; that as far as the government is concerned, as far as the fair treatment you are entitled to expact from your government is concerned, the people who will be your advocates are people who are very much interested in domestic oil. Now, whether you are a domestic producer or are interested primarily in overseas -- and I am happy that at this time most of the oil producers who produce overseas do have very substantial domestic holdings here -- so it is very much to your advan tage to have a very healthy domestic industry and do everything within your power to cooperate to that end.

I believe you are doing that. Most of you know this, but sometime ago under the Kennedy Administration a lot of these essential problems and particularly those that had to do with the oil industry were decided in the White House. The President wanted it that way.

Now, under President Johnson it is going to be more the other way around, it is going to be decided here, and I believe that will work out very well, because unless I misjudge President Johnson't intentions, and I don't think I do, it is his desire that these problems should be considered at the department level, by someone who will understand the problems and will have reasonable sympathy for your problems -- understand them and sympathize with your problems.

Now, I have seen some Senators take the Floor, and I have in mind some that I could name to you, and want to speak

as long as 24 hours in protest against the appointment of someone who might be sympathetic to the problems of the oil and gas industry, insofar as oil and gas problems were concerned.

But I wonder if that same Senator would have the same attitude if one of our oil and gas people was just as protesting against one of his dairy people. My guess is that if we were to be as unsympathetic against one of his dairy people, that that Senator would be quickly complaining about it and protesting against it, saying that it was tyranny.

one of the old-timer doorkeepers of the Senate tells me he can recall the days of young Bob LaFollette, who was one of the flaming liberals of Congress. I have the highest admiration for Senator LaFollette, and I wouldn't speak about him otherwise, and I think he was one of our really great Senators. But he was a great liberal as long as it came to talking about the other fellow's business. But when it got down to talking about the economy of the dairy farmer in the State of Wisconsin he was just about as conservative as anybody in that body. And I think that the same thing is true of the other great liberals about somebody else's business, I think they get very conservative when it gets down to their own particular interests.

Now, we have in our State a lot of natural gas and we have fought for many years to try to give our gas producers the right to sell on a competitive basis. This Senator is the chairman of a subcommittee on monopoly. It is a subcommittee of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24 25 Small Business. And the thing that I have fought for has been the right of everybody to compete on equal terms so as to get his fair share of the market, and to try to prevent monopolistic practices and techniques from being used to cut out competition.

Now, oddly enough, as far as I can determine, our people producing gas are about the only part of this entire economy that is just fighting and begging and pleading to sell its commodity on the market in competition with all commerce at the going market price, and if we cannot sell a better product at a cheaper price then we don't expect to get any business. So far as I know this is the only commodity in America where someone has something to produce and has something for sale who has someone standing in his way saying, "Oh, no, we won't let you sell it at the price," a price which is better than the public can get anything else for -- "We won't let you sell it unless we have the right to run your business for you, and make you sell it at a price below what both the producer and the consumer are willing to agree upon as a fair market price and a better price than what the consumer expects to pay for what he is getting now."

N^Qw, we are going to continue to do whatever we can about that battle. So far we have had very little success and sometimes I think maybe it is because our statutes are not what they ought to be -- and I think I have a right to speak towards that, because I am a legislator, that is my business,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I do hope that some day we get this Federal Power Commission business worked out to the extent that it will both help the pipelines who render that service by affording them the kind of profit that will -- that they are entitled to make in competition with others who are not similarly regulated, and also permit the gas producers to sell their products freely in competition with others. T_{3}

The kind of economics that I have seen advocated in the case of gas producers is some of the most ridiculous that I have ever seen, some of the most ludicrous. Some whould want to argue, for instance, that a gas producer would sell gas in interstate commerce for a cheaper price than he could get in the State right where he is producing gas -- it would be ridiculous for him to do it. And of course a gas producer would want to hold his gas until he can sell it for what he considers to be a fair price for it. And the national interest requires that we let him set up a fair price as soon as that is possible.

Now, those of you who may have some connection with pipelines know that we were able to make some headways in getting consideration for the pipelines in this last tax bill. We passed a tax credit about two years ago, and in this bill we repealed what was called the Long Amendment. Now, that was my amendment to the tax bill. Some of you may wonder why the Long Amendment -- may wonder why the Senator Long from Louisiana would support the repeal of the Long Amendment on this year's

8

10

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

tax bill, when that was the largest amendment on the previous tax bill.

The reason I did it is because I had offered the amendment two years ago for a reason which no longer existed. I offered that amendment two years ago because this Senator had moved to strike out of President Kennedy's tax bill of two years ago practically all of the tax increases that were proposed to recoup revenues and I was trying to find some way to reduce the extent of the tax cut when it became law--the investment credit -- and when they brought this bill up, it was obviously a tax reduction bill and the biggest tax reduction in this country or, for that matter, it was the biggest revenue bill in the history of the country, either the up side or the down side of it -- a calculated revenue loss of about 11.5 billion as it was finally passed, and this was offered to provide incentive, to offer business incentive to expand, to provide better service, provide more jobs, and to increase efficiency, and it asked for support on that basis.

And this Senator spoke for the repeal of the Long Amendment, so Long was the leader in the defeat of the Long Amendment when it came off the statute books. Senator Proxmire wanted to keep it on the books and I proposed at that time that if he was successful in saving the baby from the burning building we ought to name it after Proxmire, because he was the proper father of it from that point forward.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, all of that was just to put this in its proper perspective. And coming back to our pipelines, our pipelines are competitive with other industries. They have to compete with the railroads. They have to compete with the airlines, in some respects. They have to compete with the trucking lines, with all of these transportation carriers, they are competitive one agains t the other, and the pipelines particularly are competitive against the tanker fleets which are not regulation to a so-called fair return on their investment.

And in view of the fact they are competitive they have to make a profit that would compare with those with whom they are competing, and so they should be permitted to the full advantage of equal tex credit on their new investments, and should be permitted to keep it rather than have the Federal Power Commission take it away from them. And that was the position that prevailed, and it was not too easy to make that position prevail. We won by about three votes on that one. And in my judgment that was about the toughest single fight that I had to carry out on the Senate Floor with regard to the tax bill. But it was right.

Now, some people don't concede this. To me it seems fair, to recognize that whatever you might regard as a fair return on investment at a time when manufacturing and the oil industry are making a fairly low profit, is not a fair return when the general profitability of all industry goes up.

G St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

].

In other words, what might be regarded as a 5 percent
return or 6 percent return, that it might be a fair rate of
return for industry, if the average for industry is 7 or 8
percent. But if the average return for industry goes up to 10
percent then it is not fair to say that 5 percent would be a
fair return, it should be nearer the 10 percent, as near as
the competitive nature of industry can make it, and as between
industries all of which are competitive and have to compete
for the customer and which are not locked in monopolies in that
resepct, then the rate of return for the regulated carriers
who are not guaranteed a monopoly, should be permitted to go
as high as those that are not regulated with a certificate of
convenience and necessity.

I am hoping that one of these days the Federal Power Commission comes to recognize that point. They have not so far. But by statute we have made some headway in that direction and I am hopeful that we can go further along that line, if it has to be done.

Mr. Secretary, we think you are going a great job. We think that you have at heart the interests of industry and that you are doing your best for it. But I just want to say to you and to your very capable assistants, Mr. Kelly and others, that I hope you won't ever expect us to be satisfied. fact that you have us up here means that you want us to make some suggestions as to how we think the problems should be

4

6

8

9

10

11

1.3

12

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

handles. And we would like to continue to make those suggestions. And let me say that I am going to make them whether you invite them or not, as far as this Senator is concerned.

(Laughter)

SENATOR LONG: We think you have done a fine job in handling these oil imports and we hope you will continue doing a good job. This Senator speaks as one from a producing State and we would like to see you have a firm control particularly on those Canadian and Mexican imports, and we would like to see a program spelled out so anybody could read the rule book and see if it is being done deliberately or not, and we think you have made long strides in that direction.

And as representing the domestic producers of a very large oil producing State I hope very much that you will proceed along that line, and that you won't be afraid to do what every other country does, and that is to look after its own interests. All other peoples do it and they are not ashamed of it, and I don't think we should be afraid to do it.

Over a period of time more and more of these people are recognizing the need to protect the essentials of certain domestic industries.

Some years ago I addressed a cotton association. Back at that time oil was one of the few commodities that was produced in this country with regard to which there were large amounts of imports, and nobody was very sympathetic to our prob- 4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lem. Since that time we have had worlds of people moving in our direction. The textile people have their problems. the automobile people came up with their problems. Then the glass people had some problems and various others.

And now we are conducting hearings that I am playing hookie from at this moment to be at your meeting, having todo with beef. Our beef fellows are having problems. And all of them are having problems in that respect, and so my guess is that we will be having more of a sympathetic understanding of the needs of industry to stay in business and that they will help to promote others so that they can stay in business themselves.

I don't think we need to have their help very much in order to have the legislative power to protect our interests in the Senate but we will work with them if they will work with us. That is the only way I can see to handle this trade problem, esepcially when America has helped people to get efficient in producing oil and producing textiles and producing almost any commodity that they produce, automobiles or anything else.

And if we are going to go over and show them how to do it, and take them our best machinery and our best managerial talent and teach them our latest methods and make them more efficient producers and low cost producers compared to us --in many instances because of their having cheaper-priced labor --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23 24 25 ς Sι., χ

then we are going to have to protect ourselves, we are going to have to protect our own industry, we can't crucify it because we have called upon it to help somebody else become efficient producers. And the only way I can see to do it is to provide by law some way so that we can accept a reasonable amount of imports, which we have in this industry, and give firm protection to the industry beyond that point.

Let me say it is a pleasure to be here and I appreciate the invitation, Mr. Secretary. I think you have done a great job for us, as I have said, and we are pleased that the President has givenyou additional powers and placed upon you additional responsibilities. I know he has done it because he told me he has done it, and we believe that our problems are in good hands, and we appreciate very much what you are doing for us -but please don't expect us not to ask more of you, because we think you realize our problems and we think you understand our industry and certainly we are going to continue to call upon you, and we hope that you will continue to do what you have been doing, and that is let our people advise you from time to time as to what they think can be done. Thank you so much.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you very much, Senator Long, we very much appreciate it.

Our next speaker is our co-chairman, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

Mr. Secretary, before I ask you to come to the micro-
phone I would like also to refer to the Presidential mandate
which you received with respect to clarification or strengthen-
ing of your authority with respect to the oil industry. I
might say, having fought two wars under the administration of
the Department of the Interior, I don't think any oil man reall
requires any strengthening or clarification on his part as to
the status of the Department of the Interior in relation to oil
affairs. I think we have always felt we can look to you as our
very good helper.

However, I am glad that we have this codification and I wish to assure you that it is most welcomed by the oil industry. We feel we have a very important, very complex, and a very sensitive industry which involves many factors which are not too easily understood. And with the knowledgeability and understanding of the Department of the Interior and of yourself, knowing that, it is a great source of comfort to all of us and a great ground for confidence and of assurance. are all very happy that this thing has come about.

And now may I introduce -- of course, I don't have to introduce our co-chairman, the Honorable Stewart Udall.

(Applause)

SECRETARY UDALL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank Senator Long for coming down. him that he is always straightforward and he always says what

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

he thinks, and he certainly spoke just like I expected Senator Long of Louisiana to speak, he said right out what his views were, and I hope that this did afford him a little opportunity to get warmed up for the day up on the Hill -- I don't know whether this is your day to speak or not, Russell, but we are glad to have had you here, to get your inside views on some of the important matters that have been before the Congress in recent weeks.

I must say with regard to our new responsibilities -- I am sure, John, you will agree with me -- I don't find less work on my desk, I don't find any less criticism, I don't find life easier. But we are here to do a job and take whatever responsibilities or criticisms and occasional praise that comes our way. Life certainly has become more interesting for us. As a matter of fact, I think I should tell you about our travels last week in Venezuela. You may have heard some reports but I want to give you the full story. I don't know how many of you have had an experience quite like this, but I think Secretary Kelly and Cordell Moore and I have a few moe gray hairs that we didn't have.

We went down to Caracas to represent the President at the inauguration of the new president of Venezuela. Incidentally, I know that those of you who are familiar with that country, have ties with that country, realize the significance of it. It is the first time in nearly 140 years since Bolivar founded

l

the Republic of Venezuela that any president who was ever elec-
ted in a free election finished out his turn and transferred
power over to his successor and, of course, in terms of military
juntas, military dictators, this country has some of the worst
in times past, and some of the biggest coups and I think
this is a great accomplishment, very great, and I think we
ought to recognize the significance of it, in this country.
We all know, fof example, our great neighbor in the south,
Mexico, that their real progress began when they got political
stability. They had their own formula for achieving it. And
in Venezuela I think they have reached the point of maturity
there, although they are still on a high wire, and a new dic-
tator may come and knock a government off but I think that
this has been a tremendous achievement, and I took some pride
in the fact that the American companies that are in Venezuela
have established very good relationship, stable relationships
with the government, I think they have been a stabilizing influ-
ence, in recent years, in helping them work their way toward
democracy.

But I was going to tell you about our adventures. We went down a week ago Tuesday, I guess it was, to see the Maracaibo oilfields and since we didn't feel we should fly a plane of the American oil companies, we were sent down a DC-3 of President Betancour's with a couple of pilots.

And as the pilot or copilot got on he brought a Bible

2

7

5

9

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

with him and set it down on the table, and we kind of looked at one another and wondered whether this was the normal procedure, part of the normal equipment in Latin America in flying aircraft.

And after we flew down from Caracas, about an hour and a half, two hours' flight and circled around, we looked at some of the fields from the air and finally landed at what appeared to be a very small field because the plane came to kind of a screeching stop and there were cattle on the runway. And we got out expecting to be greated by dignitaries and so on. But the man who came out of the only building that was there, looked as though to say, "Well, who are you and what are you doing here," and it turned out that it was the wrong field and so we got back into the plane.

And we observed that when we left the runway we just mushed over a fence at the end of the runway and then we got back in the air and there was a very bad haze which caused problems, but also it turned out that the people up front didn't have the right maps -- (laughter) -- which seemed to have some effect on things, and a half hour went by, forty-five minutes, an hour, and we were still circling back and forth and around and continuing to find out where we were, and it turned out later that we had no radio contact with the ground -- (laughter) -- and finally, in about an hour and fifteen minutes someone came bqck from the cockpit and picked up the Bible and took it

up front -- (laughter).

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 1.0

11.

12

1.3

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

At that point, I must say, we were beginning to be a little uneasy as to what was going on, whether it was a religious revival meeting or just what was taking place. And soon after that we landed in another field. And it turned out we weren't welcome there, either. There was no welcoming committee. It was the wrong field. And at that point we got up our nerve, and we -- the Venezuelan minister, my counterpart, was there, and some of his people, and John Kelly was asking what the reason was for taking the Bible up front, he was beginning to want to get the facts, want to know what was going on, and he said, well, the pilot, since they didn't have the right maps, he felt they ought to have the Bible up front. And he said, "Well, what does he do with it?" And he said, "I read him a psalm."

And so we managed to carry on our mission, although it was abbreviated and the final touch on it, though, was that we got back to Caracas and I was telling the Ambassador about all of our adventures; as a matter of fact, the pilot of one of the other planes, when we told him the name of the field where we first landed, he said, "Well, it can't be that field because a DC-3 won't get off that field." (Laughter)

And when I got back to Caracas adn was telling the Ambassador about our adventures, I said, "Really, I am worried now, but I wasn't worried then because after all we had the plane

G Sl., N. W., Washington 1, D.

of the president of the country and we had his own pilot and

I felt very safe about it all along." And I said I wasn't disturbed. And he said, "Well, I think I should tell you that President Betancour doesn't trust aircraft and he doesn't fly except
when he has to." (Laughter)

And so life does have its interesting moments and I hope that you people when you go down to Maracaibo have a little easier time of it than we had.

But in a more serious vein, I would like to say that we are aware of the importance of the new responsibilities we have with regard to petroleum policies. But I want to make one point very clear about this because the thing that he said to me and the thing that he said to the press and to the country was that he wanted to have the pattern followed as it was in Franklin D. Roosevelt's Administration when Harold L. Ickes was Secretary — in other words, that Interior was recognized as the primary department of the government where the policy decisions would be made. This was the statement that was made and this is the way it should be understood.

We were not told that we were to disregard this country's responsibilities to other nations. We were to take into account policy considerations with regard to American foreign policy or our relations with neighbor countries or other countries, because after all in any decision-making process we have to work with other departments, we have to listen

5

9

10

11

12

13 74

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the State Department people and we do. We have to take into account considerations of policy by other departments, by the Department of Commerce, and we have to go through the process of listening to all who want to be heard on policy-making matters, and I think it is very important that this be understood.

This is one of the reasons why we have had increasing conversations with representatives of such countries as Canada -- I have gotten on very close terms with ministers, for example, in recent months, of Canada, Venezuela, who handle petroleum matters, and other officials from other countries I have gotten acquainted with.

My point is that we must in making policy take into account all facets of the problems that come before us and try to make policy which makes sense not only in terms of domestic industry but in terms of the national interest and I think this national interest test is the thing that should be stressed and emphasized, and I hope that none of you would want it otherwise, because we have to have policies that will enable our country to remain strong, and to make its own contributions in all parts of the world with regard to world stability.

I should like to say the more I get acquainted with this industry, the deeper I get into its problems and contributions, and go to a country like Venezuela, for example, I think that more than any of us has realized the petroleum industry in

1.1.

this country for the past 20 or 30 years because of its venturesomeness, because of basically American venture capital, that in
terms of the export of technology and know-how to all of these
parts of the world where there have been significant discoveries,
that this has been a tremendous contribution in terms of economic development. No one can describe it as a foreign-aid
program, but in many of its aspects it has been very extremely
successful as a program involving the investment of capital,
of investment, of skilled people and, of course, increasingly
and in all parts of the world the governments of these countries
that have rich petroleum deposits, as they become more stable,
as they acquire skilled technicians of their own, and with their
own hard bargaining, they are able to look out for their own
interests — and this is as everyone would want it.

But it is apparently one of the very significant contributions that this country has made in the last few decades, in the area of the economical development of the world, and it is because of the fact that we have been venturesome enough to go into some of the far-away places, undeveloped places of the world and help them develop their resources and make this kind of contribution, and I think it is something that the industry ought to take a great deal of satisfaction in. And I wonder sometimes if this side of the story has beentold enough.

But this Department not only has responsibility in regard to our international activities, our oil imports -- and

l

this is not an easy program to administer, as all of you know.
In some of its aspects we have to have a great deal of volun-
tary cooperation from the industry. We have gotten it in the
main. We have tough problems, have had them in the past and we
have some tough ones coming up. I just want to appeal to all
of you to help us make the program work because we can't
make it work on our own. I can assure you of that. Here we
have to have your cooperation, we have to have guidance. We
have had a few bumpy places on the road and with the help of
some of you we have gotten aroundthem, and I hope we continue
to proceed in this way.

One of our other major responsibilities, of course, one that this Department has an extreme interest in, is that of oil and gas conservation. That is also intimately related in our opinion to the public welfare on broad grounds because upon the prudent development and use of our resources depends to a large degree the long-term future of our country. So we intend in discharging this responsibility to speak out from time to time, to try to exercise leadership, try to exercise moral persuasion where that is necessary. And I think you all have noted a few days ago the position we took and what we attempted to do with regard to the new oil fields in Ohio.

We found when we sent our people out to look at it, conditions that were reminiscent of the conditions that prevailed in the oil industry in the days when our knowledge of reservoir

1.0

15

20

25

conditions was only rudimentary. And I took some pride and watisfaction in Venezuela to find that there, again under the working with and cooperation of the government that the American companies that were there and the international companies that were there, that conservation practices are at a very high level, and this is as it should be. We should go into other countries and help them extract their resources under no standards and conditions that are less than we would use in trying to maximize the recovery of petroleum in our own country.

The reason we became concerned about the practices in the new Ohio field/from the standpoint of conservation of this very vital resource. We are aware of the fact that the primary responsibility under our governmental system rests with the States and our attempt was to alert the governor, to alert public opinion, and to alert opinion in the industry itself so that we could bring to bear public opinion and public pressure to help encourage the type of practices that are now pretty well standard in this industry.

We feel an obligation to encourage in every practical way the taking of measures to bring about an adjustment in practice to conform with current advanced knowledge of geology and productive energy as it applies to oil and gas reservoirs. It has been most heartening to me to know that much progress is being made due to the active intervention of the Governor whose response was very positive and very constructive, and of

1.3

other responsible officials of the State of Ohio and members of the industry, and particularly the members of the Ohio Oil and Gasa Association.

And so I think this is an example of the kind of thing we intend to do. I should like to encourage any comments or suggestions that you in the industry may have as to how we discharge our responsibility in this field. I think there is a national interest and that we should speak up for that national interest, we who have the final responsibility in this Department for this great resource, to see to it that it is used wisely and to see to it that practices are followed that enable the people of this country to achieve the maximum potential of the resources of this country, and especially of a resource of this kind.

Let me say one other thing too that is on my mind in regard to the petroleum industry. I know that any industry that is alert is concerned about its publicimage and certainly the oil industry has to be very much concerned with public opinion in this country. And I can think of nothing that can do more to encourage favorable opinion with regard to this industry or any other industry as to have it take a broad and constructive and active interest in all of our resource problems.

I was delighted and I said to Frank Ikard the other day to see some of the booklets that the API has been producing

with regard to other resources because the thing that we find
in this Department that has been quite an education to me during
the past three years and I have spent a lot of time that I
really didn't have to spend working on a book which I tried to
express some of this in that more and more in the type of
complex society that we have, with advanced technology, our
ability to do so many things with resources, that all of our
resource problems overlap, and I think those leaders of any
segment of industry, any industry related to natural resources,
are going to do more to help the country and do more to help
themselves if they take an interest in the overall picture
because each of our industries not only is concerned on the
one hand with the extracting of its resource and on the other
hand of using a resource such as water, but all these resources
are related and our total national strength and particularly
what happens in the future will be determined in the main by
the type of practices that we establish and adopt in conserva-
tion of all of these resources.

So the fact that some of the companies -- most of the companies -- and I am taking time out to praise some of the things that Sinclair, Richfield and others have done with regard to carrying on conservation cam paigns, educational campaigns that concern wildlife and outdoor recreation and fish resources and so on. You can and are making a significant contribution.

G St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

And I cannot think of anything that will do more to make the American people realize and take a sympathetic view towards the problems of and the contributions of this industry or any other industry than for this to be deepened and broadened and I think the more that this industry is one which the country feels is concerned with our total conservation problem in this country, why, the more you will find a sympathetic public opinion with regard to your major problems.

I am informed that the committee under the chairmanship of Ed Warren has brought up to date and completed the task of bringing up to date our knowledge of the petroleum position of the Soviet Bloc and what we may anticipate with regard to plans of petroleum export to the free world in the next few years. In view of the important changes recently indicated in the Soviet's targets for oil, I feel that your comittee's analysis and judgment will make a forcible contribution to this government's appraisal of one aspect of an important world energy picture.

In the vital field of planning in oil and gas on possible nuclear attack, I know that two subcommittees worked under Mr. Nickerson's committee and have labored long and effectively to improve the government's position in pioneering in this field of activity. One of the committee's reports has suggested model plans for company operations post-attack

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

for guidance of management of meeting related plant security problems in oil and gas, and these will be submitted today in final form for your approval.

The other phase of the study from the government standpoint involves a very broad range of problems both operating and administrative to be diligently pursued qud they will we hope be ready for submission in a few more months.

I wish to emphasize in particular our appreciation for this major effort on the part of your industry to advance the very vital security planning of our government. As you know, this is not only a new type of study but a very difficult one, and also one in which values can be gained by the industry as well as by government. Many of the technical experts who produce these reportsinevitably will acquire a comprehensive knowledge of the problems involved from the government point of view, as well as that of the industry, and hence their qualifications to effectively operate in dire emergency, should that become necessary, will be greatly increased. And in other words, we are building a core of people who are doing thinking and who have some experience in this area and so there we have a reserve to call on in much the same way as some of our military resources, such as the National Guard or Ready Reserve.

This is the type of value that makes the dedicated efforts of the industry in collarobation with the government so unique and rewarding.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Turning now to the future, your Agenda Committee I understand has received for review yesterday several requests for new surveys and studies that may place upon you a heavy load of action for the coming months. These requests relate to new appraisals of our crude oil resources in the United States, from the standpoint of total oil in place, and a new measurement of the productive capacity for petroleum and natural This will be tremendously helpful in our planning for our future needs. Planning is going to be the essence of our efforts properly to resolve the many problems that all of us see coming up in the future.

These studies and a preliminary consideration of the problem of fuels convertibility will provide a broad range of valued information. I sincerely hope that you will find it possible to undertake this program, and let me say in this connection that we are hoping within coming weeks to move on into a new phase with regard to helping work out policy guidelines and to identify problems in the field of the great oil shale resource which as John Kelly described is the ultimate Persian Gulf of the United States.

There are a lot of tough policy problems. We are trying with the help of people inside and outside the industry to identify them. And of course we want to see to it that whatever policies are worked out that they are policies that make sense in terms of the future and that make sense in terms of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

917 G St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

the orderly operation of our full energy industry.

Just as we benefit through the increased understanding of problems beyond our own nation, so do we also gain from an understanding of the new issues with which this country and with which this industry are confronted. A few years ago we broke new ground in inititing the Soviet oil study, and we may need to make other landmark studies in the future.

I would just like to say in closing that although I had thought that I had waded out pretty far and was pretty deeply involved in petroleum policy matters, certainly in the last few months I find more and more problems on my desk and more and more of my time devoted to the problems of the petroleum industry in this country and to government's responsibilities in this field.

And I do want all of you feel we have tried to have an open-door policy in our Department with all of the people of industry, any industry that affects the Interior Department. And we had in recent months a visit of delegations representing various associations. And any time a group of people or individuals have constructive suggestions to make, well, we will not only read your letters or meet with delegations or meet with individuals, but it is our effort to run an intelligent, alert and, we hope, open-minded Department in all of its responsibilities.

And I hope that you will find in the coming months

1.7

that we will do just that.

I would also like to say that I expect to expend whatever time is necessary in terms of the Council and its work and
in terms of our other respon sibilities to see that we do the
most effective job possible. And I thank you again for being
here today and thank you again for all your past help

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FOLIS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Maj-uski.

MR. MAJUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that after having reached the ripe age of three score ten and plus, that I have had about two and a half pages of material written here, but after listening to Senator Long telling us what a hell of a bunch of guys we are, and after listening to Secretary udell's report of his trip to Venezuela and getting lost and all that, I think that — I have been in this oil racket since 1909, and sometimes I feel I am lost in it. I feel lost sometimes, in spite of my lifelong experience with it.

It is my privilege to pay Secretary Udall a trabute for his recent forthright statement about the milkman's attack from the Senate, the Senator of Wisconsin on the people that serve the government.

Now, I am in favor of people knowing what they are doing but his objection is to people who on weekends -- now, I can't an swer him on weekends because I go to church. But

I want to take this opportunity to say that Secretary Udell revives my faith in Washington, and it is my privilege to say that I appreciate the Secretary having t' ourage -- in Illinois we say the guts -- to defend the men } ares to help himm And he is wise also in getting people who are experienced in the work they are supposed to do in the Secretary of Interior's office.

so I congratulate and thank you, Mr. Udall, for your courage. And let me thank you for defending the men you hired, Mr. Secretary, and the courage to do it, and you do it beautifully. And also to thank you for what you said just now. You have spoken wisely and thoughtfully and we are glad to be in the hands of one such as you. You are doing a terrifically good job and we have faith in you.

(Applause)

chairman follis: Thank you. Now we have the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Mineral Resources, John Kelly wo, as you all know is directly responsible for our affairs and with whom we associate so much -- and certainly he requires no introduction.

MR. KELLY: Barney, all I can may is thank God it is s_t^{\perp} . Joseph's Day and not St. Patrick's Day. If this meeting was held two days ago I am afraid the Irish part of Majewski would really have taken over. (Laughter and applause)

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary has given the Department's

5

9

10

1.1

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

message, and also the thanks to the industry for the help that the industry has given us in the Department, especially the Office of Oil and Gas who work closely with the personnel of the National Petroleum Council.

I only would like to add my thanks to the Secretary's and also, Mr. Chairman, to thank the other departments of government that also work with us. They have representatives here present at our meeting here today.

so that all may know, in the Department of the Interior we of course have the Office of Oil and Gas which office works the closest with the Council; also the Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, the Office of Coal Research -- believe it or not -- and the Department also has the Oil Import Administration adm the Oil Imports Appeals Board These are all represented here today with us.

From the other departments, the Department of Defense one of the largest customers of petroleum products, is very ably represented and I think we will hear from the senior officer later on in the program.

We also have people from the Office of Emergency Planning, the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Power Commission. One of our old friends, Larry O'Connor, I think is The Department of Justice, the Department of the here with us. Treasury, the Maritime Administration, the Atomic Energy Com-

1

3

5

4

7

6

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

25

23 24 mission, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Agriculture Department.

And then from up on the Hill we have staff members from the various congressional committees that are interested in the problems of oil and also the problems of national defense. And, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank all these people from the different agencies and from the Hill for their fine contribution and help when we call upon them in trying to work out the chores that the Interior Department has, and also in emjunction with the studies that are made by the National Petril eum Council. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Now we will hear from the Committee on Impact of Oil Exports from the Soviet Bloc, J. Ed. Warren being the Chairman. Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, Secretary Udall, S nator Long, gentlemen:

As you all know, this assignment of this particular study was an up-dating and reappraisal study of the report that was made in 1962 to the Council. I might review with you just briefly some of the things that went into that original report.

The Committee after considerable deliberationin outlining the procedures and guidelines for the report came up with that the committee should get into this in as exhaustive a fashion as possible and that it should be objective, res-

ponsible and reliable, and to make the greatest contribution to the government on that basis.

Essentially the problem resolves itself into two sections. One of them: What volume of exports would be available above the needs of the Soviet economy to go out into free world competition; and secondly and very important, that volume that went out, how was it used?

The objective in many cases, as we all know, has been for political purposes and not to achieve commercial ends. So addressing myself to the first part of this problem, it meant that a very exhaustive and intensive survey had to be made of the capability of Russia to produce oil, to refine it, transport it, and also looking at their own requirements, to look at the whole energy picture.

In order to do this a subcommittee was appointed with people that had technical proficiency in all areas of petroleum, refinery experts, production, economists, and from every end of it. And I am simply stating and leading up to the fact that this subcommittee was the people that have done the work on this report.

The revamping of the report with emphasis put on areas such as production and transportation and refining in greater detail than went into the original report. Previously the chairman of the subcommittee was George Searcy who was not available for this study and we prevailed on Mr. Jim Meredith,

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

the chairman of the committee, and I think he and his subcommittee have done a very, very fine job. And Mr. Meredith will present to this Council by means of some slides the findings, and afterthat I will move the adoption of the report. Mr. Meredith.

Mr. Meredith, will you just take CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: over?

Thank you, gentlemen. I think that MR. MEREDITH: all of you know that the subject of trade relations generally has been much in the news here lately. Secretary Hodges has been making some comm ents. Secretary Rusk has been making some comments. And the New York Times of last week had an article about a detailed study of the Soviet oil industry, conducted by some anonymous European expert.

I think that behind this rejuvenation of interest in the subject of East-West trade relationships and Soviet oil is principally one development, and that is the economic ferment which is going on inside Soviet Russia and the Satellite countries at the present time. As you know, they are having agricultural difficulties. They are having to import large quantities of wheat.

They have announced major new investments in the area of chemicals and fertilizers. They have a problem of how they are going to gain access to resources which they need to achieve these ends. We know that they would like to import many items

1.3

1.5

from the West, both materials, plants, and technology. We also know they would like to be able to import these things through the use of lon g-term credit from the West.

Now, while that might help the Soviets, it would seem to pose a very important policy issue for Western governments.

Now, if they cannot get the kind of assistance that they would like to get from the West and if they are going to import the many things they need, they are going to have to find another way of paying for them. And as we all know among these emmodities which they have available in quantity for sale to us, petroleum is that which is in most widespread demand.

major incentive to increase their oil export drive in Western markets in the years shead. And yet we know that they are having internal economic difficulty, and indeed in recent months they have made some downward revisions inoil production goals.

Now, this is the range of considerations which the committee took into mind when it was preparing its report, the one we are going to submit to you today. As Mr. Warren, just now said, we looked at some parts of the previous report and went into much greater detail, and we have, I believe, somewhat greater confidence in some of our views. In some respects at least I think we do.

I am going to show you ten slides which will highlight the principal findings and conclusions from the work we 4.

have just done. May I have the first slide, please?

We show you here the principal changes from the 1962 NPC report. First we would like to mention a little book-keeping, some changes in format, the forecasts have been extended out into 1970 instead of 1965 as in the original report.

Secondly, we have shown data in two forms. The first includes Cuba in the free world. We felt this was necessary in order to assure comparability with the previous report; but assecondly we have shown data excluding Cuba from the free world in order to show better the realities of the situation.

Also, there have been changes in substance. USSR crude oil reserves have been revised upward in the committee's estimate. Soviet oil production rates, however, have been revised downward, both by the Soviets themselves in their newly announced production goals and by the NPC committee in its estimates of what would in fact actually be produced.

we would like to call your attention to two conclusions in part at least new to which we would like you to focus on right at the beginning. One is that we think Soviet Russia's refining capacity in 1970 and the years immediately preceding could parhaps place a limit on petroleum products exports. Of course the Soviets will attempt to export, will be forced to export or attempt to export more of the crude rather than products because of this limit.

Secondly, and we believe this is probably the most

G Si., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

1.0

important consideration derived from our study, the purchase of Western oil equipment and technology would certainly enhance the capacity of the Soviets to produce and makine and export oil. And herein of course lies an important area of policy considerations for Western governments.

Now, these are some of the principal changes and conclusions in our study this time, and we will be elaborating on them as we go along, and we will be talking about some others.

Oh, let me remind you right here that the principal conclusion of the previous study was that oil exports from the soviet bloc would continue to grow in the years ahead and would pose increasing problems for the Western world. Now this important conclusion we continue to subscribe to. We don't think the danger is any less now than it was two years ago.

I would like to begin next by showing you our current estim ates of Soviet bloc and USSR oil exports in the years 1965 to 1970 and having done that I will look behind the end result of our study, so to speak, and show you some of the production and drilling factors and other factors whichwe believe support our conclusion.

May I have the next slide?

This slide shows oil exportability from the USSR and we begin with the USSR because of course it is the dominant element in Soviet bloc oil exports. Now, as you can see, with the assistance of this pointer here, the current level of ex-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

917

ports is somewhat lower than the figures we were projecting at the time of the last report. In total, USSR exports are down about 200,000 barrels a day, including those to the satellites and to the outside world. We believe that this is due principally to lower production estimates which lie ahead for the Soviets. And this in turn reflects the general slowing down in economic growth rate in the Soviet bloc which we now are expecting, lower than at the time of our last study.

New, the figures for 1970 are new ones, the ones that appear to the right. They show about 2 million barrels a day of exportability from the USSR in 1970. Exports at this level would be about twice the current level and as you can see, roughly about two-thirds of the total, a little bit more than two-thirds of the total is going to be going to the free world.

Now, this is just part of the picture, of course. We have to bring in satellite exports to get the overall picture. We show total bloc exports on the next slide. May I hae that, please?

Now, address yourselves first to the figures in the upper half of the slide, those relating to 1965. Looking at the total exports from the bloc to the free world in 1965 you will notice that our current estimate is marginally less than it was at the time of the previous study. However, we attach no particular significance to this, certainly the difference is small enough to be within the range of forecasting error.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

24

2.5

Notice also that while exports from the USSR to the free world are down somewhat, those from the satellites are up. And this latter development reflects several things. First, growing refinery capacity in the satellites which increases their ability to export products and, secondly, a slower economic growth rate in prospect for the satellites than we were thinking last time, and therefore lesser total energy needs; and finally a progressive diversion of products exports into the Soviet bloc from Rumania toward the free world. The satellites as well as the USSR have a need to earn foreign exchange.

Now, you might be interested to know that currently satellite exports to the free world are running to about 110,000 barrels a day, which would seem at least indirectly to confirm the forecast we had previously made.

Now, at the bottom half of the slide you see what we are expecting for the year of 1970. And as you can see we are showing a total figure in the form of a range rather than in the form of one particular figure. We believe that the economic uncertainties which face the Soviet bloc and the unsettled nature of Western policy with respect to trading with the Soviet would make the pinpointing of one precise figure misleading.

Now, we have for calculation purposes in other parts of the report taken approximately the midpoint in this range as the figure for bloc exports in 1970, but we think they might

just as easily be in the top of the range as in the middle.

in 1970, that would mean that the dependence of the free world outside the United States on Soviet oil would have increased from about 6 percent currently to roughly 9 percentby 1970.

Whether within the range or beyond the range soviet exports in the year 1970 eventually emerge, will depend upon what kind of policy the Western world adopts with respect to trading with the Russians, and it will depend also upon the importance which the Soviets attach to oil as a form of foreign — as a winner of foreign exchange and also as perhaps an instrument for increasing influence in the Western world, and for creating an occasional bit of mischief.

Well, now that you have seen the committee's estimates of what Soviet bloc exports will be in the years ahead,
let's look behind the situation and start by taking a view at
current thought on oil production in the Soviet Union in the
years ahead. May I have the next slide?

As you may know, among the major energy forms in the Soviet Union, oil alone has consistently exceeded production goals for each of the first five years of the Seven Year Plan, the Seven Year Plan referring to the years 1959 to 1965 inclusive. Now, perhaps for that reason the Soviets felt very optimistic in 1963 and they revised upwards their production goals for oil. Later in the year pessimism returned and they

917 G St., N. W., Washington I, D. C.

1.2

1.8

21.

W., Washington 1, D.

S.S.

revised the goals downward to 4, 800,000 barrels a day or about the same as the upper end of the range that had been programmed in the Seven Year Plan.

This estimate of 4,800,000 barrels per day for 1965 is 100,000 barrels a day less than the NPC committee estim ated will in fact be produced that year. Now, looking at 1970 production plans, the 20-year plan calls for a level of 7,800,000 barrels produced in 1970. Early this year the Soviets announced a new goal of not less than 7,000,000 barrels a day for 1970. We have been unable to decipher the reasons for the cautious language.

But in any case it is the committee's view that actual production will at least attain this level and could well exceed it and show a range of from 7 million to7,400,000 barrels per day and for calculation purposes, once again we have picked a figure of 7,200,000.

On the right-hand side of the slide we can see that USSR production goals for natural gas have also been scaled downward. The current estimate made late in 1963 for production in 1965 is 4.4 trillion cubic feet. The committee's estimate once again is a bit higher than this. For 1970 there is a more substantial downward revision — incidentally, the 8.8 trillion cubic feet represents the committee's current estimate of likely production for 1970 and was arrived at by us prior to the Russians themselves having decided to revise downward their

ן ק

estimate to the same figure.

Natural gas has not been as successful as oil in meeting production goals but this appears to have been less perhaps than to production difficulties themselves than because of difficulties in transporting the gas and preparing consumers for using it. As far as we can tell there are serious deficiencies in the installation of compressors for gas pipelines.

Now, you may be wondering if Russian reserves are going to be adequate to sustain the production estimates shown here. We feel they will be adequate and indeed we are much more optimistic on this score than we were in the last report. And we will show you the measure of our optimism on this next slide.

As you can see the committee new estimates that proved oil reserves in the Soviet Union at the end of 1960 was some 30 percut higher than we had been thinking at the time of the last NPC report. The new assessment which we have made derives from several considerations.

First we have some newly available and fairly deailed information from three large producing fields which contribute about 30 percent of the total Soviet production. We
also have made a detailed examination of Soviet water injection practices. You may know that the great bulk of Russian
oil is produced from fields which have been water injected.

On the basis of these considerations we believe that

1, 17

٦٦.

not more than 20 percent of the ultimate recovery from fields so far subjected to water injection has in fact been produced. There is a lot left in the ground.

The 32 billion barrel figure for end of 1963 which is the committee's estimate does not include a 10 to 15 billion barrels secondary recovery from fields which so far have not been subjected to water injection. Our conclusion is certainly that there will be sufficient reserves, more than sufficient reserves in the years up to 1970 to support the planned production.

Now, oil in ground of course is one thing. Getting it out of the ground is another. This raises the question of what the Russians have programmed in the drilling area. And we will show you something of this in the next slide.

Now, in the previous report the NPC committee expressed some skepticism about the adequacy of the Seviet drilling undertaking. We now feel that with their revsied plans they are pretty much in the ball park.

Production goals for 1970 have been scaled down by about 10 percent. On the other hand drilling has been increased by about 5 percent. That is not apparent on the slide but it is true. The total amount of drilling which the Soviets have now programmed for the 1964-1970 period is 345 million feet and this is only marginally less than the amount which the committee had calculated which will be necessary to attain the

1970 production goal.

I might just make one observation about drilling technology in the Soviet Union. As many of you know they are heavily committed to the turbo drill. They have stated many times that it is the best and they are out to prove it. We believe that this reliance on the turbo drill willcontinue through the period of the forecast and this is a significant consideration because in recent years the Soviet Union has drilled less than 50 percent of the footage per rig month which we have achieved in the U.S. using all kinds of drills.

If the Seviets were to go to rotary drilling they could probably achieve better results. But once again to do this they would probably have to import tubular equipment and technology from the West. Our assumption has been that they will continue to rely on the turbo drill and if they should change and somehow gain access to western facilities they might be able to speed up their drilling program.

Now, so far, gentlemen, we have said that the Soviets have lots of oil in the ground, that they are going to have adequate drilling effort to get it out. The next question logically is, what about their refining facilities? Are they going to have enough to satisfy local needs for products and for export? On this next slide we show you the committee's estimate of current and future refining capacity.

In 1962 Soviet capacity was 3.7 hundred thousand bar-

דר

1.5

1.6

2.5

917 G St., N. W., Washington 1, D.

rels a day and the committee estimates that to have the volume of products necessary for internal consumption and for export which have been projected, they will need 4.7 million barrels in 1965 and 6,800,000 barrels in 1970.

Now, there is a question, I believe, about how they will get all the refineries that they need for the capacity required. Much of it of course they can install themselves. We do know that they have expressed increasing interest in recent months on the possibility of acquiring whole new refineries from the West. They are talking about a 200,000 -- 240,000 barrels a day refinery and they are indicating that they would like more than one. They are trying to buy the most up to date refinery they can get with all the latest built-in technology.

Presumably, having this latest information would provide them with prototype information which they can use for further construction within the Soviet bloc. Now, this sort of development one might judge might have military as well as economic implications and would perhaps be one of the things. Western nations might wish to consider in their decision about selling these things to the Soviets.

I would like to turn next to two slides on transportation facilities. And I will begin first by examining the
pipeline situation in the Soviet Union.

Secretary Rusk a few days ago in his comments before the Foreign Relations Committee suggested that he thought the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

٦٦

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

917

time was now ripe for re-examination of East-West relationships in trade and in the course of his remarks he had some things to say about the Soviet pipeline construction program and the efficacy or lack thereof which the NATO recommendation against the mie of pipe to the Russians may have had. As I read the comments the implication was that this sort of thing really didn't make much of an impact upon the Soviets, it might delay their construction a bit but really it would make them more self-sufficient and has no larger impact.

I think it is important to look closely at the facts as to what exactly has happened in the Soviet pipeline construction program. Our best estimate is that by the end of the seven-year plan the Soviets will have succeeded in installing only slightly more than 50 percent of the oil pipeline mileage which they had programmed for that plan. The gas pipeline program has don excetty well. But oil is far, far behind schedule.

Unquestionably one of the major limiting factors has been an inadequate supply of large diameter pipe. For 1959 and to 1963 the Soviet purchased over 1 million metric tons of 40-inch diameter pipe from four western countries and this volume of purchases amounted to more than 40 percent of the entire need for 40-inch pipe in the seven-year plan. They wouldn't have been able to do nearly as well as they have done had they not had access to these supplies from the West.

1.9

.

Now, we have no evidence that the Russians have been successful in creating pipe building facilities of their own in the quantity necessary to achieve their program ends. The committee's view is that pipeline construction for oil lines for the balance of this decade will probably proceed at a pace no greater than they have been achieving in recent years, and as I have indicated this is less by far than they have programmed.

hear so much about is this Comecon System and recently there has been an extension down to Odessa added on to the system. This entire system with the exception of this line (indicating on slide) and perhaps this branch to Klaipeda which may now be scrapped because of having difficulties with the harbor, the remaining portions of the system should be completed by late this year or early next year. The western portions of the line, those leading into the Eastern European satellites, are already completed and are being supplied by oil at the eastern terminal from tank cars.

There remains a good deal of the remaining trunk line there (indicating) which requires the large pipe, to be completed.

Now, there are two other major lines with export potentials. There is a line leading up to Leningrad which has been completed this far (indicating) and the rest is under

G St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

1.5

construction. There is a line leading from Stalingrad, which no longer is a popular title, so it is called Volgograd now, down to the Black Sea, with two spurs going off here (indicating). These two bits at the end have been completed, and this part (indicating) has not yet been completed.

shown here with export potential were to be completed by next year Soviet oil carrying capacity to export bases could be increased about 1,100,000 barrels a day. However we have estimated more conservatively that perhaps only 700,000 barrels of new pipeline capacity for export purposes will be available by next year. We feel, however, that this together with the rail-way transportation systems available through tank cars in the Soviet Union will be adequate to carry to export bases the volumes of oil which are programmed for export.

Now, clearly when the entire system is completed and perhaps expanded as additional supplies of pipe may make possible, the Russian capacity to put oil out to the free world would be greatly increased. Moreover the cost of moving this oil will be substantially reduced. We estimated that to move oil from the Kuybyshev area here (indicating) over to here by rail costs perhaps 90 cents a barrel, and to move the oil via pipeline will cost only about 30 cents a barrel.

The transportation cost in total from the Urals and through here and up into this entire Scandinavian area has

5 St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

(indicating) will be substantially less than those for oil moved from the Persian Gulf.

we think then that there will be no serious internal transportation difficulties which will prevent movement of oil to export bases in volume sufficient to meet the export quantitities which are programmed. If the pipeline program should be accelerated conceivably more could move to market.

Now, a word about the Soviet tanker fleet. We will show you that on this next slide.

In the seven-year plan it was hoped and scheduled that there could be an 80 percent increase in the size of the Soviet tanker fleet achieved beginning from 1959 to the end of 1965. In fact, by the end of 1965 the Soviets will have succeeded in virtually quadrupling the size of their tanker fleet. We believe this is one of the best indications of what their plans are with respect to putting oil into Western markets. Because most of the new tonnage which they have gotten has gone from free world yards rather than Soviet yards and therefore there has been a heavy foreign exchange drain involved and we don't believe the Russians would have entered this had they not had the view that this addition to their fleet would make an important contribution to oil exports.

As you can see, by next year we feel that the Soviet tanker fleet will be largely independent of reliance upon free world chartering for moving exports. I am not saying they won't

with what they have themselves together with new construction and new orders plus the transportation which is likely to be arranged by their own customer such as the Finns who use their own fleet to a very extensive extent to import Russian oil, we think these things combined will leave very little need for the Russians to enter the chartering market themselves, as there is only a very modest deficit in their resources.

Now, gentlemen, one final word about the kind of.

prices that they may be charging in the years ahead. On this
next slide I show you what the picture of pricing has been up
to 1961. You are generally familiar with this picture.

Beginning here in 1957 and extending to 1961 Russian oil prices to the outside world decreased steadily. They then leveled off and they continued to level off through 1963. Prices to the satellites on the other hand have been at a much higher level, around the \$3 level. This calculation does not include Cuba among the satellites.

price for the last couple of years would have been down to \$2.60 roughly. That is because in the developing romance between Mr. Castro and Mr. Khruschev, Mr. Castro managed to extract some very favorable oil prices, around \$1.49 a barrel. This would appear to be one of the prices in turn which the Soviets paid to secure that the Cubans did move toward the Soviet

1.9

bloc -- assure that it did.

Now, to some extent it may be true that these higher prices charged to the satellites are recouped by the satellites charging the Soviets for goods they sell them. But unfortunately the available data on this matter are so sketchy that we cannot reach any firm conclusion.

Now, let us come back to the price charged the free world. At this level (indicating) prices are around \$1.36 a barrel. Soviet statistics themselves show an average price to the outside world f.o.b. Soviet border of about \$1.36 per barrel in 1962. Some prices naturally were lower. The Soviets indicate that the price to italy f.o.b. the Black Sea in 1962 was \$1.30 per barrel, and depending on the kind of customers they took in Italy they could get even more low prices than this. The price of \$1.30 f.o.b. the Black Sea would mean about \$1.47 laid in for Italy.

Now, if you take a freight rate of a net of \$1.47 back to the Persian Gulf, you get about a dollar, which means that if you compare the average Soviet export crude with a comparable mideast crude and for this purpose we have taken Arabian 34 degree crude, if you take this crude which has a posted price of \$1.80 what you arrive back then with this net back of a dollar is a discount equivalent of about 80 cents to the barrel and of course as I suggested depending upon the particular price you use in the consuming market you can get an even

3 - 15

1.8

1.9

greater discount equivalent, and if you consider the average 75 cents a barral of revenue which goes into middle eastern governments, this would mean very little left over to cover cost of production, of in ternal movement to the seacoast and the middle eastern countries and to cover return on investment, if any, it would make a very difficult competitive situation for free world companies to try to compete in.

Now, I do not want to suggest that the only reason we have stern competition in the international oil market these days is because of the Russians. We do, however, feel that this is one important factor which might help explain some of discounts we face in the international market these days.

what about the prices they are going to be charging in the future? You probably read reports in recent months that the Soviets are trying to increase the price of oil. The best detective work we can do leads us to the conclusion that there is no discernable trend at all, upward or downward, from the levels you see here. There are increases of prices in some countries but there are contravening areas of decreases of prices in the same countries.

For instance, in West Germany last year, it appears in this case that the Soviets increased prices for distillates and heavy fuel oils that they sold in Germany but at the same they increased the price for crude and motor gasoline in Japan, and there is at least one case of a minor contract being can-

1.0

case of a larger customer actually bidding the prices up. So far there is no upward trend that we can detect.

Now, surely it would be to the advantage of the Russians if they could do so and still sell the same amount of oil. The problem they are faced with is how they can acquire a lot of foreign exchange and we don't know how they evaluate the elasticity of demand for their products and it may well be the case that they feel that to get larger quantities of exchange what they have to do is develop more oil and this could of course involve even more intensive price competition than we have so far seen.

That concludes the slides. Let us have the lights on and I would like to make just a couple of concluding comments.

What we have said is that the Russians have lots of oil. They are going to drill it in adequate volume. They have transportation facilities which seem to be adequade to get planned exports to the outside world. Now, a major conern is how much assistance will they get from the outside world in achieving their plan.

I tried to indicate as I have gone along that the technology and equipment of the West could help them in a number of major areas. In their drilling western technology and equipment could well step up their drilling rate. In their

l

refinery needs modern technology from the west could make major contributions to their efforts. Increased quantities from the west could accelerate their pipeline program. There are just any number of ways by which increased western participation in the Soviet effort could speed up what they are tryingto do.

and we feel that it is very important to keep this in mind. We don't believe that the Soviet oil threat to the west has diminished. We think in some ways it may have increased, at least psychologically, because there are a number of western countries today in the threes of reevaluating their trade policy with the Soviets. One would hope that they keep all of these facts in mind.

Gentlemen, that concludes my remarks.

(Applause)

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Meredich. Are there any questions?

MR. PENLEALLA (Department of Commerce) Is it a fact that we think or you think that the Russians are going to be producing less, meaning that they are going to be experting less?

MR. MEREDITH: Based on the scaling down of their production plan, we feel in considerable measure this is a reflection of a slower rate of economic growth within the Soviet Union and therefore a very substantially reduced total use of energy in the Soviet Union. Our current estimate of current

 $\hat{Y}_{i} \neq \hat{Y}_{i}$

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

22

24

25

total energy consumption is much below what it was at the time of the last report. So although production will be down some their own consumption will go down and we feel that there will be only a very marginal if any impact on exports. And if you examine the figures you will see virtually no change from the last report.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, we neglected -- that is, I neglected to say in my opening statement that in the preparation of this report the members from government were very helpful. The cochairman for the subcommittee, Mr. Charles Moore, has as also Mr. Fred Lock who is cochairman for the general committee -- one thing that is significant is that most of the information that has gone into this report had to be dug out and translated from the Russian because the technological papers in Russian had most of the information that was available, and the committee had to interpret and that of course was quite a chore in itself.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the introduction in the last paragraph which I think is a significant thing to keep in mind, wherein they say that our export predictions are based on assumption that there will be a continuation of existing trade policies. Should these be relaxed bloc exports to the west and probably would be in excess of the levels which we have forecast.

A. More pipeline facilities would speed their pipe-

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

line construction program.	B, refineries mad	vailable from
the West would enhance the	Soviet capacity to	port products
and probably would raise th	he level of total	orts. C. West-
ern drilling equipment wou.	ld speed up producti	on rate.

The committee therefore believes that the question of western trade policy with communist countries is a matter of paramount importance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move adoption of the report.

> CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Is there a second? MR. MAJEWSKI: Second the motion.

GENTLEMEN FOLLIS: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion made and seconded. All those in favor please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Mr. Warren, I would like to say for the Council that we deeply appreciate the hours of work that you and your committee and Mr. Meredith of the subcommittee have put into the bringing about of this report.

Now we have the report of the Committee on Emergency Preparedness for the Petroleum Industry. Mr. Nickerson.

> Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary: MR. NICKERSON:

The Committee onaEmergency Preparedness is pleased to report to the Council at this time. The work of the committee falls into two parts. First, a subcommittee under Mr. W. L. Ingram of the Standard Oil of California will make a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

76

17

18

19

20

22

23

 24

25

217

final report to you on its work dealing with industry and government planning and preparation for a possible emergency.

Second, a subcommittee under C. F. Dodd of Socony Mobil will make a progress report to you on its work dealing with government and industry planning for action after emergency has occurred.

I now introduce Mr. Ingram who will present to you for your approval two instruments; one, an up-dating and consolidation of two manuals dealing with preparation for emergency published by the National Petroleum Council in 1955. Second, he will present to you prototype company survival plans that can serve as guides for planning that various types of oil companies could undertake to achieve readiness in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. Ingram wants you to understand that if your approval is granted is subject to certain minor editorial revisions that he has not yet had time to make because of the amount of work that his committee has been called upon to do. And as I say these final reports being submitted to you will be And now may I present to you Mr. subject to minor revisions. Ingram. 21

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, members of MR. INGRAM: the National Petroleum Council and guests:

As Mr. Nickerson has informed you I was fortunate enough to have a working committee to work on the project that

1.8

1.9

he enunciated, and our charge was to produce a prototype set of plans with the hope that the petroleum industry and gas industry would undertake to add to the plans that some of them already had in the field of emergency effort.

Secondly, as a part of that project to up-date and revise if necessary two manuals that had been issued some nine years ago.

I was very fortunate in having an excellent committee given me to operate on this project. Mr. Paul Hopper of the Department of the Interior was cochairman and has provided me with excellent guidance and help, during the course of our work. Mr. Vincent Brown, your Secretary, was of inestimable help to me in leading me through certain complications that I had not had experience inhandling before, and then from industry we had Mr. Gardner Blackman from Tidewater on the West Coast, Mr. Fisher of the Pacific Gas and Elentric Company on the West Coast, and that gave us the liaison for their participation with the gas industry, and Mr. J. Forester from Standard Oil of Indiana and Mr. Otto Hier from Schio and then two gentlemen from Phillips, from Socony and from Sinclair and Shell and finally from Standard of New Jersey.

At the very outset our committee enunciated the course that we should consider emergencies that both could be considered as man-made and those that would be natural in their origin; that we should design a simple plan or plans accompanied

with the necessary guides and thirdly that we should develop reference material.

Our reports which you gentlemen are going to consider this morning are broken into two parts. The first touches in outline form on all the important steps that are inherent or required in the design of emergency planning. It shows the application of those steps to a large integrated company, to an operational unit of that company or to a division of it, and finally there are some plans there for the smaller company.

We would like for you to look at this particular volume as a specification, if you will, or blueprint of emergency planning.

The second volume is basically a text. It results from the updating of the two manuals to which I previously referred and goes in depth into a number of the points covered in the first booklet and is provided with a very copious bibliography for those of us who wish to research the matter in greater detail.

Now, I would like to present in a rather fapidin fashion the highlights of the first volume which is the one that we have designed and which itself is complete to guide any organization into putting into effect a simple, practical emergency set of plans for emergency. So if I may have the first slide.

(Note: At this point the auditorium was darkened

G St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and a slide presentation was made which was not reported.

MR. INGRAM: Let's have the lights turned back on.

We believe that in these reports we have provided here a practical and an effective route for the industry/to follow in designing such plans suited to their own particular requirements. We believe this can be done at an extremely modest cost.

Now, all of the elements you have seen here as I ran through these slides rapidly are representative of certain plans that are now in existence in certain companies. are practical. They are useful and they have been tested. Thank you.

> MR. NICKERSON: Are there any questions or discussion? (No response.)

If not, I move adopteon of the report MR. NICKERSON: CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Gentlemen, you have heard the Is there a second? motion.

> I second it. MR. MAJEWSKI:

It has been moved and seconded to CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: adopt the report. All in favor please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. NICKERSON: Gentlemen, I want to express my thanks to Mr. Ingram and to the members of your subcommittee for the conscientious and effective way in which have carried I would now like to introduce Mr. Charles out your assignment. Bodd who will report briefly on the work of the committee dealing with actions government and industry could take after an

emergency.

In this regard I want to say that because of the complexity of the assignment this is only a progress report. The work will not be complete although it is expected about the middle of June so no action is requested of the Council at this time. Mr. Dodd.

MR. DODD: Mr. Chairman:

This is the interim report to the Council, merely to explain the nature of our assignment and to tell what has been accomplished and to say what remains to be done.

The Committee on Emergency Preparedness for the Petroleum Industry established on the 15th of July of last year a subcommittee for the emergency petroleum gas administration manual. Themembership of the subcommittee represented cross-section of the integrated oil companies and the independent producing and refining companies.

Liason was maintained with the Emergency Advisory
Committee for Natural Gas through a member of that committee
serving on our subcommittee. Our subcommittee was assigned
the task of reviewing the emergency plans of the Federal
Government that are designed to assure an adequate supply
of petroleum and gas in time of national emergency, and in
particular the subcommittee was asked to review the emergency
plans of the Department of the Interior and the adequacy of
the organizational structure of the Emergency Petroleum and

917 G St., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gas Administration, its plans for the recruiting and training of staff of the organization and the authority it needed to assure effective operation in energency; and finally the Office of Oil and Gas provided the subcommittee with an outline of topics covering pre-emergency planning.

The subcommittee was to review the outline and comment on the kinds of information that should be available to the Emergency Petroleum and Gas Administration, the types of manuals and operating procedures that should be developed, and the adequacy of plans for communication channels to enable the Emergency Petroleum and Gas Administration to be activated and brought to operating efficiency with a minimum of warning.

The subcommittee has held five meetings. 24 working papers have been prepared and reviewed by the subcommittee and most of the investigation of government planning has been completed and suggestions as to how the planning might be improved in some areas have been delineated in the subcommittee's discussion, but there still remain some factors which require further investigation.

Work has commenced on drafting the final report covering those areas which have been reviewed on which definite conclusions have been reached. An initial table of contents of the final report has been agreed upon by the subcommittee and members have been assigned responsibility for drafting sections of the final report.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

1.0

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The subcommittee expects that its final report will be submitted for consideration by the Committee on Emergency Preparedness for the Petroleum Industry about the first of June of this year. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you. Now, we will call upon Mr. Mark V. Burlingame. Mr. Burlingame is a member of the Council but in this case he is appearing as vice chairman of the Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas. Mr. Burlingame has a post which was manned by Assistant Secretary Kelly in 1962. This group was established by the Department of the Interior to conduct a study and prepare a report to the Sacretary of the Interior recommending those courses of action which in the committee's judgment would best assure an adequate supply of natural gas in the event of an attack upon the United States or the involvement of the United States in a limited war or period of international tension. The report is to include detailed emergency operating plans, organizational arrangements and staffing of the emergency organization to gather such information as is necessary to fulfull the objectives. We would be most interested to hear your report, Mr. Burlingame.

MR. BURLINGAME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary. The Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas is under the chairmanship of Mr. McGraw and the other cochairman is John Ricker, both of whom are out of the country

5

6

7

8 9

10

1).

12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

this morning, so the vice chairman has to do the work.

In presenting this progress report of the Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas, acknowledgment of the cooperative effort by all facets of the industry as well as the responsible government units is necessary. We could not have accomplished as much as has been done in the short period that we have been in existence without that cooperation. Whave been given unlimited help from producers, distributors, transmission companies and governmental agencies such as the Office of Oil and Gas, F.P.C., F.C.C. and industry groups such as INGAS and your own NPC. The liaison has been remarkable and we are deeply appreciative of this help.

The assignment given to the Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas was in general:

- 1. To formulate a plan of emergency operating procodures which could be adopted for
 - The indusdry, and
 - The individual company.
- To formulate a plan to be operable in any type 2. of national emergency, including an all-out nuclear attack.
 - To formulate a plan of action for
 - a. The period of pre-emergency, and
 - b. The period of post-emergency.

In setting up these plans we have limited our sphere of operating activities to that area starting at:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

٦4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

C		
Ľ		
ర		
ş		
<u> </u>	•	
7		

	1.	The	point	where	the	tra	nsm:	issic	n	compa	ny	takes
possession	OI	resi	onsib:	ility	for	the	gas	and	er	ding	at	

The point where the delivery is made, i.e., city 2. gate or where the transmission company's responsibility ceases.

The plans are now well along and, while the work is far from completed, we can report that much of this monumental task is in process of accomplishment It is also felt that the work has proper direction toward the goals as set out. Among the accomplishments are:

- The updating of facility maps which were first produced for the NPC two years ago. These maps, which are on military base maps, together with related data, show
- Line location, size, operating pressures -- hores power of all compressor stations of 1000 horsepower, or larger -- majorriver crossings, type of crossing, whether overhead or submerged, size of pipe, etc. -- all in terconnections with other transmission systems, including size of interconnection and facility capability.
- This material information has been put on computer cards for ues in damage assessment analysis.

This work has been carried out under the direction of Mr. Orlofsky, vice president of the Columbia Gas System. It has been a tremendous undertaking and we are indebted to Mr. Orlofsky and the Columbia Company for their leadership. They were given cooperation by 163 companies which, we believe,

represents one of the finest cooperative efforts by an industry to the national defense effort.

The EACNG also gave Mr. Orlofsky the task of the chairmanship of the committee to write proposed manuals for:

- 1. Individual company survival plans.
- try planning, a real imaginative approach was necessary in order to coordinate transmission companies which start in one defense region, cross one or more other defense regions, to serve a market in still another defense region. We feel that the plan now accepted by the EACNG at its meeting on March 5 of this year accomplishes this objective. The companies are grouped by market areas served and are tied to regional and national over-all direction.
- 3. The manual group is further investigating with F.C.C. an approach to cooperative use of communication facilities. This will look into interconnection possibilities with:
 - a. Other gas transmission companies
 - b. Production companies
 - c. Common carrier communication companies.

It is felt that a more comprehensive cooperative study is n eeded in this area.

A further area of study which we shall give consideration to will be a study of fuel interchangeability. The FPC is to take the first look at this as the larger energy

consumers are of course the electric generating plants. Many of these are equipped for multi-fuel use. The annual reports of the electric industry to the FPC should give some clues as to fuel interchange possibilities. Other larger energy consuming industries, such as metal reduction, will have to be studied on a company-by-company approach which we may ask the local, as well as the gas transmission companies, to investigate.

We feel we now are ready to zero in on our objectives and that the Emergency Advisory Committee for Natural Gas will be ready, within a reasonable time, to present an overall plan for dealing with pre- and post-emergency situations as applied to the gas transmission section of the industry.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you. I would like now to call on Lieutenant General William O. Senter, Director for Petroleum Logistics Policy of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense of the Department of Defense. We will be glad to hear you, General.

GENERAL SENTER: Mr. Chairman, Secretary Udall and Secretary Kelly:

I will make my remarks very short. We have had some very in teresting talks this morning and some very interesting reports. At the outset, however, I would like to say to Sectetaries Udalland Kelly that I hope that if again you find yourselves in the sort of situation like you were in Venezuela,

you might call on the United States Air Force for help.

(Laughter)

outstanding group as the National Petroleum Council and to be afforded the privilege of saying a few words. At your July meeting which was before my moving to my present position, I had the opportunity of meeting quite a few of you and was introduced formally to this council along with Admiral Bryan of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It would be very interesting this morning to talk about the A-11 and the development of the fule and lubricants for that very exciting aircraft, but for obvious reasons of security we will have to postpone that discussion until another day. Instead I will hope that a few comments about my office, its place in the government structure and some experiences of the past few months will suffice for a get-acquainted session.

ponsible for providing advice and assistance to the Secretary and the military department s on petroleum policy and mobilization planning. This means simply that we must insure that our military forces have adequate petroleum supplies both in wartime and in peacetime. This availability must satisfy the quality as well as the quantitative requirements of our fighter forces. And at the same time I want you to know that we fully realize that an extended emergency demands adequate petroleum

products for the civilian economy if the military war effort is to be industrially supported.

Now, as many of you know, back in 1950 my office was known as the Munitions Board Petroleum Division and it had about 50 people assigned to it, both military and civilian.

Today my staff consists of 9, including myself.

As this reduction in so-called in-house capability continues, mobilization planning for future cold, limited and nuclear wars must continue and, in fact, it is even more complex. It is obvious then that we are almost completely dependent on outside sources for our information, assistance, and just getting the job done.

The Department of the Interior by virtue of the President's Executive Order of 1962 has the responsibility for preparing national emergency plans and developing preparedness programs covering petroleum and gas.

However, basic assumptions, military requirements and other necessary information must still be developed by my office to cover a theoretical war emergency. After the Office of Oil and Gas has developed world-wide supply and demand studies, again it is our responsibility to issue long range logistic guidance on petroleum for the Department of Defense.

One of the most reliable sources of basic information on petroleum are those studies prepared by the National Petroleum Council, some of which you have had reports on this

morning. These are used, I assure you, by the Department of
Defense in day to day work, and of course they are particularly
important to the Office of Oil and Gas in preparing their studies.

I am familiar with the reports prepared by you. They are high quality, professional products of great value inour military readiness program.

So I assure you that the National Petroleum Council is doing an extremely valuable public service not available from any other service, and I hasten to add that your continued assistance, advice and support through our good friends in Interior is welcomed.

And as many of you are probably aware, my logistics experience and training had not been focused on petroleum as such before taking up my present assignment last August.

Once assigned, I have tried to make up for my lack of back-ground and experience by going around and seeing as much as possible of the activities for which I have responsibility.

I began my basic training by visiting many of the military petroleum installations in this country as possible, by going to the petroleum indoctrination course at the Deense Fuel Supply Center and the Standard Oil Company of California last September and Ocdober, and the latter part of October I went to Paris in connection with some of the NATO petroleum matters and attended meetings of the various NATO petroleum committees that are involved and have responsibility for the

operation of approximately 3,500 miles of pipeline in Central Europe. I saw these facilities as well as the United States Army pipeline which extends across France.

After returning I sandwiched in several trips to

New York and other cities to visit with the various oil com
panies and to visit various U.S. military installations in the

States as well as Puerto Rico.

accompanied by representatives of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, JCS and Strike Command and others. We visited in Germany, Italy, British Isles, Turkey, Greece, Spain and several Mediterranean islands. This trip was of primary importance to both myself and the service representatives. Why? Because the many operational problems that arise from day to day are difficult to understand and resolve fr m a desk in the Pentagon, but more so if you are not familiar with the location and the type of facilities.

with a trip to the Pacific and the Far East this
summer I will have seen a major portion of the military petroleum installiations and will have conferred with all the various commanders and the arra petroleum officers who are responsible for the day to day operations. So by the end of one year's
duty I should have about 60 to 70 thousand miles behine me.

However, as you all so well know, travel isn't enough.
This complicated oil business with all its political ramifica-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tions world-wide is a profession which requires years of association and experience before one reallyknows even half the angles. Fortunately, to assist me, I have some very experienced people in my office as well as in the services.

Also, the oil industry as a whole has been most cooperative and many of you have gone out of your way to give assistance when requested. Particularly, the wonderful cooperation between the petroleum industry and the government has been nowd. I hope this good relation will continue.

Again, the opportunity of working with such an outstanding group as this Council is welcomed and my office door is always open for any assistance you may need on military petroleum matters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you, General. And now I want to introduce the Acting Director of the Office of Oil and Gas of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Frederick S. Lott. Mr Lott.

MR. LOTT: Mr. Chairman, Secretary Udall, Secretary Kelly, members of the Council:

It is always a pleasure to be with the Council and to feel the stimulus and the sense of purpose that is evident through all its activities.

With regard to the program of the Office of Oil and Gas, I often think it has some elements in common with an ice-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

G St., N. W., Washington I, D. C.

berg, seven-eighths of whose bulk is not evident to the casual Those of us in the OOG have seen much more than just the exposed one-eighth and we have the conviction that the continuity of our program and its effectiveness is significant to the national wellbeing and security.

We are grateful to the many and unique contributions that this Council has made and makes to that program -- the factual, technical and not the least the improvement in mutual understanding of problems of common concern to industry and to government that result from these associations. Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Lott. Well, gentlemen, that winds up our agenda, and if somebody will move to adjourn --

> I move to adjourn. MR. MAJEWSKI:

Seconded. VOICES:

CHAIRMAN FOLLIS: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 o'clock p.m. the meeting of the National Petroleum Council was adjourned.)